

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

124853

S.N. 10/632,277

Date of Response: August 2, 2006

Date of Office Communication: May 2, 2006

AUG 02 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1-37 remain pending in this application. Claims 20-37 were allowed. Claims 1-19 were rejected.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Englert et al. (US Patent 4,720,426). Claims 6, 9, 10, 13, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Englert et al., as applied also to claims 1 and 5 above. Claims 2, 3, 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Englert et al., as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Yoshida et al. (US Patent Application Publication #2002/0196628). Claims 14-17 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Englert et al., as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kingsley et al. (US Patent 5,179,284).

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application by the Examiner in light of the above amendments and the following remarks offered in response to the May 2, 2006, Office Action.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 5, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Englert et al. and rejected claims 6, 9, 10, 13, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Englert et al. The Examiner concluded that Englert et al. disclose "a reflector system for use on scintillator elements in a scintillator array of a CT imaging system, the scintillator elements having a reflective material coupled along its surfaces defined within the gaps between scintillator elements 30 (FIGs. 3 and 8), the reflective material comprising (col. 5, lines 15-25): a smoothening layer, in the form of clear polymer layer...; a metallic reflective layer, in the form of silver reflection layer..., applied to the smoothening layer 58; and, a top layer, in the form of protective layer 62..., applied to the metallic reflective layer 60 to provide an environmental barrier."

S.N. 10/632,277

124853

Date of Response: August 2, 2006

Date of Office Communication: May 2, 2006

In response, the Applicant has amended independent claim 1, from which claims 2-19 depend, to clarify that the Applicant's smoothening layer is applied to a top surface and to each of four adjacent side surfaces of each of said plurality of scintillator elements. As amended, claim 1 is distinguished over Englert et al. at least because Englert et al. alone, or in combination with Kingsley et al. and Yoshida et al., do not disclose all the elements of independent claim 1 or claim 1's respective dependent claims that recite further novel elements.

For example, with regard to the dependent claims of claim 1, Englert et al. in combination with Yoshida et al. do not disclose a smoothening layer that is etched (claim 2) or an adhesion layer that is between the smoothening layer and the metallic reflecting layer (claims 3 and 7). Yoshida et al. describe a substrate that is treated by "subject[ing the substrate] to a surface treatment...[such as] corona discharge treatment or a glow discharge treatment, or resin coating" but they do not describe a smoothening layer for a scintillator nor a smoothening layer that is etched. Yoshida et al. describe substrate [A] generally as an adhesive substrate on which the entire reflective layer 100 is formed. Yoshida's substrate [A], for use in a lamp reflector, is not appropriate for use as a smoothening layer for a scintillator.

Yoshida et al. also describe underlying layer [B] as providing a "desired barrier effect." (Para. 73) As such Yoshida et al.'s layer [B] is not equivalent to, or appropriate for use as, the adhesion layer of the claimed invention in claims 3 and 7.

As a further example, with regard to claim 13, Englert et al. do not disclose a barrier coating layer applied to a thickness of between about 1000 and 5000 Angstroms. Englert et al.'s 12.5  $\mu\text{m}$  (as converted by the Examiner) top layer 62 converts to 125,000 Angstroms which far exceeds 5000 angstroms by 25 times and is far outside any reasonable "general conditions...or working ranges".

S.N. 10/632,277

124853

Date of Response: August 2, 2006

Date of Office Communication: May 2, 2006

Therefore, for the reasons stated above, the invention is patentable over Englert et al. alone and in combination with Yoshida et al. and Kingsley et al. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-19 be withdrawn.

In light of the amendment and remarks presented herein, Applicant submits that the case is in condition for immediate allowance and respectfully requests such action. If, however, any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the Applicants' counsel at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jenifer Haeckl  
Registration No. 41,812

General Electric Company  
Building K1, Room 3A62  
Niskayuna, New York 12309  
August 2, 2006  
Telephone: (518) 387-6191 or  
(518) 387-7122